WASHINGTON, D. C., TUESDAY MORNING, MAY 9, 1876.

。在1957年,在1967年以前的1967年,李元等**的基础的数据的数据**的数据。李元璋中的联系列,由新疆

NO. 141.

EXTRADITION.

PROVISIONS OF THE TREATY

BY ACT OF PARLIAMENT

AFTER THIRTY YEARS' OPERATION

Such Doctrine Flatly Repudiated THE FRESIDENT'S CURT REFUSAL

TO ASSENT TO ANY NEW GUARANTEES

HISTORY OF FRACTICE UNDER THE TREATY

Precedents All Against Great Britain The following is a copy of Secretary Fish's dis-

ratch to Mr. Hoffman, our Secretary of Legation at London, upon the Winslow extradition case which caused the abrogation of the tenth article of the Ashburton treaty:
MR. FISH TO MR. HOFFMAN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, March 31, 1876. tody in London, I have now to acknowledge the receipt of your No. 39, enclosing a note addressed to you by Lord Dorby, of March 8, and your reply

f the same day. With General Schenek's No. 881 was enclosed a ecte from Lord Perby, dated February 29, in which it was stated that Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department had drawn at-tention to subsection two, of the third section of the British extradition act of 187s, and feared that the claim by this Government of the right to try Lawrence (who had been recently surrenred) for crimes other than that for which he had been extradited amounts to a denial that any such law as is referred to in the British act exists, and the disclaimer of this Government of the existence of any traplied understanding in respect to trial for crimes other than extradition or together with the interpretation put upon the act of Congress of August 12, 1:42, (which is doubtless n error for 18-8.) preclude any longer the belief the existence of an effective arrangement which Her Majesty's Government had proviously supposed to be practically in force, and it was added cretary of the Home Department was sidering that no such law exists, he would have no ower, in the absence of an arrangement, to order proceedings had been taken for that purpose Lord Lerby called General Schenek's atten-tion to the intimation which he had received from the Home Department, and requested that the

the Foreign Office, as distinguished from the Home Office, expressed no opinion on the question invoiced, but confined itself to requesting that the views of the Home Office might be communi cated to this Government.

matter be brought to the knowledge of this Gov-

A few days later, however, on the 5th of March Lord Derby assumes the more advanced position previously occupied only by the Home Depart ment, and writes as follows: "Her Majesty's Government do not feel themselves justified in authorizing the surrender of Winslow until they shall have received the assurance of your Gor ernment that this person shall not, until he has been restored or had an opportunity of re mitted prior to his surrender other than the ex that this decision be communicated to this Govern-

s, referring to the general practice for many years under the treaty, and calling attention to tion of the act of 1-70, in the case of Bouvier. No further correspondence has reached this

The rensons given by Lord Berby for the course attended in his note arise, as he states, from who hed taken place in this country in the Lawrence

Moreover, it has been stated that the Home opinion that not only had some understanding been reached as to the particular crime for which Lawrence should be tried, but that i States, and of the general laws of extradition of than the particular extradition offense for which

With regard to any such understanding, either expressed or implied by any authorized declara on or engagement of this Government, no evidence is additiond-none can be addition. This Government asked the surrender of Lawrence. precisely as it has asked the surrender of all other Britain, under the treaty of 1842, complying on its part with the requirements of the treaty, and neither by expression, nor by implication, enter-ing into any "arrangement," but simply requiring the lugitive to be "delivered up to justice. chension and commitment for trial if the crit r offense had been there committed.

Great Britain recognized the compliance by this

Government with all that the treaty required case of Lawrence needs, possibly, a passing re-

eral occasions. forgeries, whereby the Government of the United States claims to have been defrauded to an amount not far short of two millions of dollars, on custom house entries. He is supposed to have of having shared in the spoils resulting from these alleged frauds upon this Government.

A large number of indictments have been found

against Lawrence, and proceedings, either civil or criminal, are either pending or imminent against supposed accomplices. It is supposed that procecution of these cases might possibly disclose names on either side of the Atlantic, in connection with the alleged frauds, not yet brought

before the public. In the spring of 1875 Lawrence fied, and escaped to Europe, and was arrested, under the assumed name of Gordon, at Queenstown, on a requisition for his surrender under the treaty. Sir Thomas Henry, in London, twelve or thirteen distinct charges of forgery, each on papers con nected with a different involce of goods. The representatives of this Government supposed the extradition was made on all the charges; but the letter or report of Sir Thomas Henry to the British Home Office led to the issue of a warant of surrender of Lawrence on a single charge of forging a band and affidavit, on which warrant the keeper of the jail delivered Lawrence to the agent appointed by the President to receive him. The terms of the warrant were not known to any nment or officer of this Government (as is repre ed to me) until long after Lawrence's return to the United States. His commed and friends appear to have been apprised of the fact that although proof was presented on some twelve or thirteen charges of forgery the warrant of sur render seems to be confined to the forging a bond ed affidavit. Up to this date Lawre been arraigned only upon one indictment based on the forgery of the bond and affidavit mentioned in Sir Thomas Henry's report to the Home Office, and he has not been arraigned for any offense other than the extradition crimes proved

by the facts in evidence before Sir Thomas Henry, and on which his surrender was based. Although not afraigned on any other indictment than for the forgery for which he was extra-dited the British Home Office has raised the

question that he may possibly be tried upon other charges and for other crimes. It seems, therefore, that the Home Omes of

law of the United States as well as of Great Britain, and assumes that the law of the United States as well asgeneral law of extradition and the extradition act of Great Britain preven the trial of a criminal surrendered under the treaty of 1842, for any offense other than the extradited: and the position which it takes involves the assumption that in demanding an ex-tradition under the treaty the United States is bound by the provisions of the act of 1870, whether in conflict with the treaty or not, and it claims to have "supposed" that an "effective arrangement was in force," that no criminal so surrendered hould be tried for any other than the particular extradition offense; on the faith of which arrange ment it is claimed that surrenders have hereto fore been made, and without which it is now said that a surrender would not be possible under the English act; but, as already said, nothing is adluced in support of the belief of the existence of

such supposed arrangement.

These positions are so different from the under standing of this Government, and so opposed to the views which it was supposed were entertained by Great Britain, and which have been recorded n Parliamentary papers; which have been asserted in diplomatic correspondence, and been recognized in indicial decisions in that as in this country, and set forth by writers on extradition law, that I learn from Lord Derby's note with urprise, equal to my regret, that they appear to The act of August 12, 1848, reproduced in the

Revised Statutes, (section \$270 to 5276,) referred to in the correspondence, does not affect or limit the rights of the two Governments on the ques-

This act is simply a general act for carrying into effect treaties of extradition. It provides the machinery, and prescribes the general mode of procedure, but does not assume to determine the rights of the United States, or of any State, which are governed wholly by the particular provisions of the several treaties, or to limit or contrue any particular treaty.

In some few treaties between the United States and foreign countries, provisions exist that the criminal shall not be tried for offenses committed prior to extradition other than the extradition crime, and in others no such provision is in

cets of the contracting Powers are reciprocally exempt from being surrendered, while others con-tain no such exception. The United States act of 1848 is equally applicable to all these differing treaties. If the surrendered fugitive is to find immunity from trial, for other than the offense named in the warrant of extradition, he must find such immunity guaranteed to him by the terms of the trenty, not in the act of Congress. The treaties which contain the immunity from trial for other offenses have been celebrated since the date of

At that date the United States had treaties of extradition only with Great Britain and with France, neither of which contained the limitation

"he terms of the respective treaties alone detine or can limit the rights of the contracting

United States and Great Britain, by the two Governments, and their practice in its enforce-ment for many years were in entire harmony, In each country surrendered fugitives have been tried for other offenses than those for which they where the criminal was reclaimed in good faith, and the proceeding was not an excuse or pretense to bring him within the jurisdiction of the court, it was no violation of the treaty or of good faith proceed against him on other charges than the particular one on which he had been surren-dered. The judicial decisions of both countries affirm this rule. It was so held in a case of inter-State extradition by Judge Nelson, in Williams vs. Bacon, (10 Wendell, 631,) and the same principle was laid down by the Court of Appeals of New York in a late case of Adriance vs. Lagrane, who had been delivered up under the treaty with France. In United States vs Caldwell, (8 Blatchford, Cir. Ct. Rp. 131.) Caldwell, after extradition from Canada for torgery in 1871, was in-dicted for bribing an officer, and the plea was ontered that the prisoner was brought within the prisoner to be court upon a charge of forgery. under the treaty, and that the offense specified in he indictment was not mentioned in the treaty. A demurrer being interposed, the court decided the prisoner had been extradited in gool faith,

charged with the commission of a crime, and must on a charge of robbery, the prisoner was tried on sault with intent to kill.

In the case of Hielbroun, who was extra-lited from this country for forgery, and tried in Great Britain for larceny, the facts, as state i by the licitor general of Great Britain, who had charge of the proceedings, and who was examined before he late British Commission on the extradition mertion, were that the prisoner, being extra-lited for forgery, was acquitted, and was thereopen tried and convicted for larceny, an offense which he could not have been surrendered, not eing enumerated in the list of crimes mentioned

In Canada there is the same carrent of au

In the case of Von Earnam, (Upper Canada eports, 4 C., p. 288.) the prisoner was surrendered by the United States to Canada upon the charge forgery, and application was made for release n the ground that the offense was at most the btaining of money under false pretenses and not within the treaty. Macauley, C. J., said, in enving the motion, that he was disposed t regard the offense as forgery, but even if the Hense were only false pretenses after being in custody he is liable to be prosecuted for any offense which the facts may support. In Paston's case, 10 (Lower Canada Jurist, 212,

11, 3:2.) the prisoner was charged with uttering a lorged promissory note. He pleaded that he had een extradited upon the charge of forgery, and could not be tried for uttering forged paper or for my other than the extradition offense.

The court decided that the trial should

proceed. The prisoner thereupon protested against being called upon to plead to any other charge than that for which he was extradited, but he was ried, found guilty, and the conviction affirmed on

In addition to the foregoing, Judge Benedict, in his opinion in Lawrence's case, delivered within a few days past, entirely coincides in these views, and the Solicitor General of the United States, in his opinion in Lawrence's case, dated July 16,

1875, reaches the same conclusions.

An examination of the report of the select committee on extradition of the House of Commons which sat in 1858, under whose superintendence the extradition law of 1870 was framed, and which was composed of some of the mot distinguished public men of Great Britain, among whom were Robert Collier and Mr. Bouverie, shows that the law of the United States and the practice in re-gard to extradition were perfectly well under-stood, and they were distinctly referred to on sev-

Mr. Hammond, (now Lord Hammond.) for many years Under Secretary of State, in speaking of Burley's case, stated that, as it was suggested that he prisoner, who had been surrendered on the of robbery, was about to be tried for piracy, the matter had been referred to the law fficers of the Crown, and that it was held that if for the offense for which he was extradited it would be difficult to ques or any other offense of which he might be accused whether such offense was or was not a ground of extradition, or even within the treaty; and added, we admit in this country that if a man is bonsade tried for an offense for which he was given up there is nothing to prefeat his being subsequently tried for another offense, either antecedently

committed or not." (Answer 1035.) Mr. Mullens, an eminent member of the bar. who was counsel in the Lawrence case, in reply to a question of Sir Robert Collier, said that in his pinion a surrendered criminal ought to be tried or an offense, other than the extradition offense crising from the same facts; and Mr. Foster, Question 1214.) considering the propriety of the proposed stipulation, that a person should be tried or no offense other than the extradition offense, said: "The Americans do not make that stipula tion, or else you would not have been able to try Hielbroun for another offense." To which Mr. Mullens responded: "No; there is no stipulation

of that kind in the case of America." Mr. Mill thereupon said, (Question 1916-) "As I not prevent our trying a man for a different offense from that for which he had been give ot: there is no stipulation that he shall not be tried for any other offense." Then follows que ion 1217, "Would you wish to extend that state of things to other countries?" and the reply, "With egard to America I have never found any diffi-

So far as can be ascertained, there was abso lutely no dissent at any time from these views as to the law and practice under the treaty, and the only question seemed to be whether it was wise to attempt to change them.

is "Treatise on Extradition," says: "It is out clear that neither the treaty nor the law of the tradition not of 187)." It would appear, there. I pecutory successed in a treety solemnly rati-

fore, by the judicial decisions, by the practice of both Governmenta and by the understanding of the persons most familiar with proceedings in such cases, and the most competent to judge, that where a criminal has been in good faith extradited for an offense within the treaty, there is no charged, although not an extradition offense He is, in fact, (in accordance with the language of the treaty,) "delivered up to justice;" and, in the absence of any limitation by treaty, to "justice" generally, each independent State being the judge of its own administration of justice. Surely another State to prescribe or to limit the cases, or the manner in which justice is to be administer States to be less tenacious of its independence in

Now, for the first time since the signing of the treaty of 1842, Great Britain raises the question of her right to demand from the United States, as a ion of the execution by Great Brits inal charged with a series of stupendous forgeries, a stipulation or agreement not provided for in the treaty, but asked on the ground that an act of Parliament, passed some twenty-eight years after the treasy had been in force, prescribes it as one of the rules or conditions which should apply o arrangements for extradition, when made with foreign State.

This involves the question whether one of the parties to a treaty can change and alter its terms er construction or attach new conditions to its exccution without the assent of the other. Whether on act of the Parliament of Great Britain, passed n the year 1870, can change the spirit or terms of a treaty with the United States of nearly thirty rears anterior date, or can attach a new condition to be demanded of the United States before compliance by Her Majesty's Government with the terms of the treaty as they have been shown to have been uniformly understood and executed by both Governments for the third of a century. As this Government does not recognize any efficacy in a British statute to alter or modify or

a previously-existing treaty between the United States and Great Britain, I do not feel called upon to examine, particularly the provision of the law of 1870. But masmuch as Great Britain seeks to impose the provisions of that act upon the United States in the execution of a treaty of many years anterior date, I do not fail to observe that while by the act Great Britain assumes to require that no surrendered fugitive shall be tried in the country which demands his extradition for "any offense other than the extradition crimes" (in the singular) proved she reserves to herself the right to try a fugitive surrendered to her for such crimes (in the plural) as may be proved by the facts on which the sur-render is grounded.

This does not seem to be wholly reciprocal, and if the United States were disposed to enter into a treaty under this act, it might expect some greater equality of right than a cursory examination of this provision in the act seems to pro-

It is quite well known that after the passage of that act of 1870 an effort was made to enter into a treaty with Great Britian, which should enlarge the number of extradition offences, and otherwise extend the provisions of the existing treaty. At the outset it was apparent that the act of 1870 was not an act to carry into effect treaties or

conventions for extradition, as is the United

States act of 184), but one providing a system to which all subsequent treaties of extradition

must be adopted, and which could be applied to enforce treatles or arrangements made subject to This Government was unable to agree to any arrangement [based on the provisions of the not of 1870, and in a note addressed to Sir Edward Thornton, the British Minister, under date of January 27, 1871, was informed that "This Government understands the twenty-seventh section of the extradition act of 1870 as giving continued effect to the existing engag Imperfect as they are, in view of the long coterminous frontier between British North America

and the United States, we must be content to suffer the inconvenience until Parliament shall

ut it in the power of her Majesty's Governmen

The British Government was thus distinctly and formally advised of the position and of the views of the United States, and no exception thereto has been expressed.

A further effort to effect a treaty was made in 1873, after the passage by the Pritish Parliament of an act amending the act of 1870, which resulted in failure for precisely similar reasons. This failure to negotiate a new treaty arose solely because the United States could not accept as part of it some of the provisions of the act of 1870, and preferred to go on under the treaty of 1842 as theretofore construed, and practically carried ent, and thus we into effect by each Government In support of the construction which this Gov-

ernment, in 1871, in the note to Sir Edward Thorn ton above referred to, gave to the twenty-seventh section of the extradition act, it appears that when the Court of Queen's Bench was called to General stated that the intention had been t cases except where there was anything inconsistent with the treaties referred to. So far as the point was passed on, the Lord Chief Justice expressed the opinion that it was the intention while getting rid of the statutes by which the former save those treaties in their full integrity and force, and that the result had been accomplished. One of the other justices thought the question somewhat doubtful, and the third agreed with

the Chief Justice. The Solicitor General of the United States, in his opinion in Lawrence's case, given in August of last year, reached the same conclusion, that the treaty was not affected by the act. intended by the act of 1870 to claim the right to

alter treaties in existence without notice to the other Government, or to impose new conditions upon foreign Governments seeking extraditions inder treaties in existence prior to that act. The United States has declin ject to the British act of 1870, and with knowledge of this the Government of Great Britain has con under the treaty of 1842, and since the refusal of the United States to negotiate a new treaty unde

Since the passage of the act of 1870 Great Britain has obtained from this Government some thirteen warrants of extradition, and has instituted a much larger number of proceedings to obtain extradition. In no instance has Great Britain thought it necessary to tender any such stipulation as she now asks from the United States, or to present her requests for extradition in any way different from that in which they were same time have instituted numerous proceedings and at this moment have three criminals in L.

don in custody upon charges of forgery, whose extradition this Government is seeking in the usual manner provided by the treaty. During this period no intimation has reached this Government that the treaty of 1842 was not in full force, or that the act of 1870 was claimed to limit its operation or to impose upon this Government the necessity either of changing its laws of giving stipulations not known to the provision of the treaty, and not heretofore suggested, nor has any representation been made to this Gov any proceedings taken in the case of Lawrence mentioned in the opinion attributed to the Home Office, in the note of Lord Derby to General

Schenck, before referred to. But now, with three important cases pending in London at the present time for extradition, in which at least all the formalities have been con had been supposed up to the present time by the British Home Office that our law as to trials for other than extradition offenses was in agreement with the law of 1870, but finding it to be other wise, we are confronted with the requirement of a stipulation in order to obtain what is guaranteed. teed by the treaty of 1842, whereby the Unite States must recognize the right of the British Parliament by statute to change executory trea-ties, and to impose upon this Government conditions and stipulations to which it had not given

its assent. As relates to the particular case of the fugitive Winslow there is not, so far as I am aware, any in tention of trying him for any offenses other than those on which indictments were transmitted and United States will give no stipulation of which the stipulation or condition is de Great Britain as a right, the right of the de-

The President regrets that a condition, which in his judgment is without any justification under the treaty, should have been asked. He regards serious character, on the final solution of which not recognize the right of any other power to change at its pleasure, and without the assent of the United States, the terms and conditions of an

fied between the United States and that power He thinks that the twenty-seventh section of th British act of 1870 was specially intended to ex-empt the treaty with the United States from the sions embodied in that act, and to leave treaty to be be construed and the sur eration Her Majesty's Government will see in the

ection referred to the effect which he sup

was designed to have. was designed to mave.

But he recognises that it is for the British Government to construe and enforce as own statutes and should her Majesty's Government finally con clude that the British Parliament has att new condition to the compliance by that Gov ment of its engagement with the United Str under the tenth article of the treaty of 1412 under the tenth article of the treaty of 1442, re-lating to extradition, requiring from the United States stipulations not provided for or centem-plated in the treaty, he will deeply regard the necessity which will thereby be imposed upon him, and does not see how he can avoid regarding the refusal by Great Britain to adhere to the provi-sions of the treaty, as they have been recipiocally understood and construed from its date to the present time, or the exaction by that Govern tion and termination of that provision

treaty. You are not authorized to enter into any scip lation or understanding as to the trial of Wins in case he be delivered up to justice. His sur rovisions of the tenth article of the treaty be ween the United States and Great Britain of th 9th of August, 1842. He is charged with a srim neluded within the list of crimes enumerate in the treaty. That crime was committed within the jurisdiction of the United States, and he has sought an asylum, and been found, within th erritories of Great Britain, and the United State nave produced such evidence of his criminality as according to the laws of Great Britain, would jus tify his apprehension and commitment for tria crime or offense had been committed

You will communicate the substance of this ord Derby, and should be desire it, you may I am, sir, your obedient servant,

CURRENT CAPITAL TOPICS

Randall's Silver Bill.

bill introduced by Mr. Randall to provid or the issue of silver coin is as follows: didiary coins authorized by law to be issued in re lemption of fractional currency, it shall be law al to manufacture at the several mints and gen through the Treasury and its several offices such oin to the amount of twenty-five millions. SEC. 2. That the silver bullion required for this surpose shall be purchased from time to time at market rate by the Secretary of the Treasury, with any legal-tender notes in the Treasury not therwise appropriated, and the resulting coin nay be issued in the ordinary disburser the Treasury or in exchange for legal-t otes at par; but no purchase of bullion shall be nade under this act when the market rate forth ame shall be such as will not admit of its coin age and issue or exchange, as herein provided, with out loss to the Treasury, and any gain or seignor age arising from this coinage shall be accounted for and paid into the Treasury as provided under existing laws relative to the subsidiary coinage SEC. 3. That the trade dollar shall not here fter be a legal tender, and the Secretary of the Creasury is hereby authorized to limit from time to time the coinage thereof to such an amount as e may deem sufficient to meet the export

mand for the same. Health of Speaker Kerr.

The Speaker's health is not of a reassuring of The Speaker's health is not of a reassuring char eter. He has wisely made up his mind to with fraw from the arduous duties and perplexing mxieties of public life and devote himself to the ecuperation of his vital energies, and, if possible the establishment of his herith. He has or an addition of ten days to his present leave of for an addition of ten days to his present have of absence, and it is understood that he will be in the office of Speaker on his return to the Capital. The canvass for the succession has already opened. Mr. Cox, Mr. Randall and Mr. Sayler, of Ohio, are in the field, and the skirmishing has begun. It is likely to be a very pretty race, but the Western man will no doubt stand the best chance. The friends of Mr. Cox count upon gain ing some strength from his present tempo possession of the office, and more from his for popularity as a Western man, but Savler' iends insist that the latter is all discounted by his present affiliations with the Tammany Demo-erats of New York. Mr. Randall's course as chairman of appropriations has by no means strengthened him, and his first vote in caucus will hardly reach that which greeted him the

Maryland for Blaine. Reference has been made to a letter from M: Maryland convention. The circumstances which led to the letter were these: A prominent and lays before the convention as follows:

"Every county in the State has chosen delegates to the Frederick convention favorable to

Mr. Blaine replied as follows: "Ordinarily I should be unwilling to express
my preference as to what a State convention
might do touching myself. But of late, as you

Nominations.

The President sent the following no the Senate yesterday: Seth W. Clark, of New York, to be recorder of the General Land office ames S. Rutan, of Pennsylvania, to be consul a Cardiff; John Nazro, collector of customs, Mil-waukee, Wis.; A. F. Riard, naval officer, New Orleans, La.; Wm. T. Jackson, pension agent St. Joseph, Mo.; John M. Cross, register land office. Huntsville, Ala.: James McLaughlin Indian agent, Devil's Lake, Dakota. Post masters-Charles M. Warner, at Jordan, N. Y. Chas. T. Jackson, Goshen, N. Y.; A. M. Whoeler

The Indians Not Starving. The following telegram was received here ye

ton, D. C.: Sir: There is no foundation whatever in Gen Sig: There is no foundation whatever in Gen.
Crook's report to the effect that the Indians of
this agency are in a starving condition. If assistance was needed, and the military stationed near
were called on for assistance, not a hoof of beef
cattle could they supply. The Indians were
never more peaceably disposed.

JAMSS S. HARTINGS,
United States Indian Agent.

Bounties for Colored Soldiers. The Speaker laid before the House yesterd ication from the Adjutant Genera ffice, in relation to an appropriation for the reedmen's branch of that office. The amount peretofore asked for was \$75,000 to pay bounties to colored seldiers, &c., for the year ending June 30, 1877, but the Adjutant General says the appr priation need not be made if Congress will make 1874, 1875 and 1876, which were made for a like pur

C. W Holcomb, recorder of the General Land Office, yesterday tendered his resignation, which ans been accepted.

BRIEF TELEGRAMS.

St. Louis, May 8 .- Whites 3, Browns 2. INDIANAPOLIS, May 8 .- Louisvilles 6, Capita New York, May 8.-The case of Moulto against Beecher was, by consent, put down for Thursday next. CLEVELAND, O., May 8 .- Hiram Garrettson

United States Commissioner to the Vienna Expeditison, died here yesterday. PORTLAND, MR., May 8 .- Dr. Rufus A. Cobb. of Minot, has been arrested, charged with mur-der by malpractice of Mrs. Eliza Caldwell, o Boaron, May 8 .- At Thompsonville, Connec

cut, yesterday, three men, named Simeon Mill John Johnson and Eppa Marks, were drowne while crossing the river, by the capsizing of the POTGHREEPSIE, May 8 .- At the general ter of the Supreme Court this morning, counsel & Pesach N. Rubenstein, moved to strike that and the case was put down for Friday next. JAMAICA, May 1 .- Great excitement prevaile here over the news of the disturbances in

loes. The natives are jubilant over the demot strations. Troops have been hurried off from ere in Her Majesty's brig Argus. HARRISHURG, PA., May 5.—A young lady, aged eighteen, while returning from Sunday school yesterday afternoon, near Duncannon, Perry county, was outraged by a supposed tramp. Her assailant fled to the mountains and has not yet FORTY-FOURTH CONGRESS. THEEX-WARMINISTER'S TRIAL

A MOST DOUBTFUL JURISDICTION

Proctor Knott's Speech Yesterday ARGUMENT OF A GREAT QUESTION

THE HAWAIIAN TREATY DISCUSSED

MONDAY, May 8, 1876.

Atll1 a. m., pursuant to order, the Senate sit-TRIAL OF IMPRACHMENT, resumed its session. The usual proclamation was made by the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Secre-tary was directed to notify the House that the Senate was ready to proceed.

The Necessity of National Defense

The managers and counsel having entered and taken their seats, the minutes of Saturday's proedings in impeachment were read. Mr. Manager Knorr then addressed the Senate, resuming his argument from the point where he suspended on Friday last. He said the line of argument which he had proposed to maintain had been so fully and powerfully followed by his colleagues that little remained for him to do except perhaps to recapitulate some of the more

ent-was designed to protect the purity of the for the accused the sole object aimed at is to se-

But the great men who made the Constitution had different ideas. They provided that not only should the criminal be removed from effice, but he should be perpetually disqualified from effice. Their design was to exhibit such an historic example as would prevent the imitation of their crimes by their successors in office. It was designed not for the harrassment of a single in fi dual, not for purposes of vengeance, but for the sake of example, as a precaution against future offences of the same kind. He said the learned counsel were dignifying their client too much when they supposed that this proceeding was merely for the purpose of harrassing and disquali

The House of Representatives, in sending the articles here, had a far higher purpose in view—the vindication and the purification of public morals. It would be extraordinary for the Senate to decide that such a monstrous anomaly existed in our institutions that a party entering in office, with all the responsibilities appertaining thereto, should escape those responsibilities by resigning. If it had been intended that only those in office should be impeached, then why did not the framers of the Constitution insert a clause "that only those in office shall be imeached." If they had intended that no man should be impeached except he was in office, then they certainly would have said so, for they were men who always said exactly what they meant. The very fact that they omitted to make this disnction is conclusive of their intentions.

THE IMPEACEMENT CLAUSE not only not susceptible of the construction out upon it by the counsel, but it does not admit At 11.66 a. m. Mr. HAMLIN moved that the Senate, sitting in impeachment, adjourn till 12:05

p. m. Agreed to.
At 12 o'clock the legislative session of the Senate was called to order, and prayer offered up by The legislative journal of Saturday was read.

ation from the Secretary of War, inclosing the report of Assistant Adjutant General Vincent relative to the bounties to colored soldiers. Referred to Committee on Appropriations. reported bill to enable Albert Moore to make ap-

lication for the extension of patent for water Mr. DAVIS introduced bill to incorporate the National Drove Yard Association of the District of Columbia. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia. Mr. SARGENT offered the following; which

was agreed to: was agreed to:

Whereas it appears that the vast is flux of Chinese to the Pacific coast is working great injury to the morals and the labor interests of the Pacific States and Territories; and whereas the existing laws against the coolie traffic and the importation of females for immoral purposes fail of execution for want of evidence of intended execution thereof. Therefore.

of execution for want of evidence of intenses, evasion thereof; therefore evasion thereof; therefore Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be instructed to consider the subject, and report a bill placing adequate restrictions upon the im-migration of Chinese to this country. The Senate then RESUMED THE CONSIDERATION OF IMPEACHMEN

PROCEEDINGS. Senator MORTON propounded the question whether there had ever been an instance where a party who had been impeached by Parliament had afterwards been tried in the courts of justice, or of a party who, having been tried in the courts, had afterwards been impeached by Parliament. Mr. KNOTT said he did not know that there was any such case. Mr. K. then renewed his argument in defense of the parisdiction of the Senate, characterizing the position of the re-pondent's counsel, when worked out to its logical conclusion, as ridiculous, and as making impeach-

tent to leave this question with the Senate; per-fectly satisfied that no large body of right-minded done, or condemn the Senate for its decision, whatever that decision might be. He could make no passionate appeals to the Senate; he could not forget that it was sitting here, the highest constitutional body in the land, called upon to decide the gravest question that had ever been brought

He thought that verdict would be that the American Senate, unbiased by party or partisan clamor, would have the sterling virtue to administer the law. He felt sure that the counsal on Mr. KNOTT was greeted with applause in the

Judge Black said that he felt as nearly as any one the importance and the gravity of the occasion. He asked that if in his embarrassment or his haste he should say anything that was improper he would alone be censured for it, but that they should spare his client, who had sutfered enough. He agreed with his friend who had just closed that this question ought to be, and he believed it would be, decided on the law of the case and free from all outside influences.

He would come directly to the subject before them. First, whether or not this party here was liable to impeachment by the House of Repre-sentatives because he was lately Secretary of War; and second, whether his resignation as Sec retary of War took him out of the jurisdiction made to avoid such jurisdiction had anything to do with the question. This latter fact had nothpurely of a speculative nature. It was improper for the Senate to determine, and wrong for him

to discuss. He did not deem it necessary for hin GROUND OF HIS COLLEAGUES, but he would address himself to some of the points of the managers. There were some points to which it was impossible for him to reply. He had listened with great admiration to the mana-

ger who had last spoken on Saturday-(Mr HOAR.) It was the most finished oration to which h (Mr. B.) had over listened. But it was given in He had assumed that everything charged agains General Belknap was true. The manager had no right to play the part of Cicero and set up General Belknap as an imaginary Marc Antony The virtuous soul of the manager is wrought up ike Lot, against the wickedness of these cities can public service is welded into one mass of cor ruption. The manager had assumed to sneer a the acts of the criminal lawyer. If he was a law yer at all he would know that it was not the thing to go into any court and attempt, in the

ARGUMENT OF A GREAT QUESTION of fundamental law, and descend to the abuse that he did. The gentleman wants a victim. He said that it was better that ninety and nine guilty men should escape than that one innocent man should suffer. The gentleman must think escaped, because he now undoubtedly wants the blood of the innocent man. [Laughter.] He re-ferred to the case of Blount, and asked why those position of Luther Martin. He was at the time the head of the American bar, and he time the head of the American bar, and he Mr. HALE then moved to refer the resolution gave it as his deliberate opinion that a man out of the Committee on the Judiciary, with insign-

office could not be impeached for acts committed while in office. The managers had also avoided all allusion to the position on this point taken in he trial of Andrew Johnson. The honorable anager [Mr. Hoan] had alluded to the remarks

of John Quincy Adams.

He (Mr. B.) would not detract from the merits of John Quincy Adams, but it was well known that of all men he was the least authority in questions of law, and he was always ready for personal contest when he could coax one out of When he could get no one to move for his ex pulsion, he presented a petition to that effect is

AGAINST JURISDICTION expressed by Mr. HOAR in the House he (Mr. B.) did not attach much importance to it, although his colleagues did. He did not think that any riticism should attach to the manager for chang ng his opinion. There was a great confiagration raging around the honorable manager, and when [Laughter in the galleries.]

The CHAIR notified the gallery that if the disorder was repeated they would be cleared. Judge B. said that he was not at all alarmed when the honorable manager advanced toward him and informed him that he was still a public officer so far as his liabily to impeachment was concerned. He (Mr. B.) knew that he had been a private citizen for twelve years, and if he lived he intended to enjoy that inestimable privilege for years to come. He then read from the opinion of Gov. Johnson of North Carolina, that impeachment only applied to those in office. He main-tained that the comments of Rowle were not usceptible of the construction put by the Board of Managers, and Story, he said, was perfectly

plain against them.

The uniform practice had been to drop prosecutions after resignation. In New York the power was not only not claimed, but, on the contrary, it was on several memorable occasions emphatically disclaimed. He did not say these decisions were binding on the Senate if they thought they were wrong, but they are entitled to great weight when all the circumstances are considered. The same in Pennsylvania, and of every other State the Union where they have co which upon this point are similar to the Constitution of the United States, and in no instance has there been a case where an attempt has bee of the States, New Jersey, for instance, they The Senate, at 1:55 p. m., took a recess of twenty

On the expiration of the recess Judge black reumed. He first discussed briefly the great power of impeachment as it had existed in England. Our ancestors in adopting this principle of im eachment placed numerous restrictions upon it. The founders of the constitution made law not for e present, but for all time and for all emergenties, and any power which was not expressly conferred was not intended by them to be conferred. In discussing the resignation of General Belknap he claimed that it was a lawful act, and his motives had no effect upon it. It makes no difference whether these things are done with the purpose and intent of changing jurisdiction, or whether it happened so. We are prepared to show that on the morning of the second of March the chairman f the Committee on War Expenditures gave NOTICE TO GENERAL BELKNAP

that unless he resigned before 12 o'clock that day In consequence of this Mr. Belknap took his resignation to the President at 10:30 o'clock, and it was accepted, and before 12 o'clock, when the House met, another person was acting as Secrétary of War. To avoid impeachment, General Helknap resigned. We do not claim that Mr CLYMER had any right to make such a compact, but General Belknap knew that he was a leading nember of the House, and that whatever he promised was very likely to be done. Suppose General Beiknap had been commander of a fort, and the chairman of the Committee on Expendi ires of the War Department had advan

him with mad battalions; that a parley was called, and the chalfman said: I have discovered a weak place in your walls where your family are, your women and your children, and unless you surrender they will be given up to the soldiery. Well, to save these helpless ones, he surrenders the fort, and the captain refuses to abide by the terms, because the surrender was made to avoid what he had threatened

The chairman of the board of managers (Mr. LORD) would have refused to abide by the terms of surrender on account of the law. He says there are no fractions of a day, and he would, there fore, contend that the assault took place the night before and the surrender the day after. to the power of impeachment because they have once been in office. does any one, for instance, say that when we speak of the President or the Vice President we do not mean the incumbents of those offices? No half-grown schoolboy but knows that, It has always been so held to mean, and the prac-tice has conformed to it, and it requires some degree of boldness for gentlemen to get up here and rgue for a perfectly new departure.

case of the impeachment of an ex-President. This was a puzzler, and the puzzle arose out of the fact that it was perfectly absurd to suppose that an ex-President could be impeached Our friends on the other side found themselves in such a dilemma by this question that they de-clined to answer it. He (Mr. B.) would say that in the event of the trial of an ex-President, that an ex-chief justice should preside. [Laughter.] One would be just as sensible as the other. The law was that members of Congress shall receive \$5,000 per annum. What would be thought of a party who was a member of Congress twenty or thirty years ago coming here and demanding \$5,000 a year? Yet that is the argument of the held that the sole object of impeachment was removal from office. This was made perfectly clear to his mind from the language, which was "removal and disqualification," not removal or

isqualification. If the Constitution is properly SUBJECT TO ANY AMOUNT OF PULLING and hauling, it may be made to cover the nakedness of any proposition, then the managers might have some show. But there is nothing more plainly explained that where there is any doubt as to the language of the Constitution, the doubt will be resolved in favor of popular liberty, and not in favor of political power. He turned here the Senators who had always been such strict constructionists of the Constitution if they could vioate now their life-long convictions. the Constitution affects private rights, then you are bound to place upon it the most narrow construction. The managers admit that this is a penal case. The Constitution says that all persons

arged with criminal offenses shall have the right to trial by their persons. This is sought to be denied to the accused and to place him on trial before a political body which may be composed in part of his rivals or his ene-nies. The Constitution provides that no man shall twice be put in jeopardy for the same of fense. Here you propose to try a man in this tri-bunal, and then turn him over to the courts. A custom-house officer may be brought three thousand miles to be tried here before the Senate, thus doing the same thing that was made one of the causes of complaint against Great Britain in the Declaration of Independence. He further, on this cint instanced that therewere some incongruities between the impeachment clauses and the parts of the Constitution, and would conclude by rging the utmost circumspection in their deci-

Mr. EDMUNDS then moved that the doors be closed and the galleries cleared, and the Senate proceeded to deliberate upon the verdict. At 5 p. m. the doors were reopened, and the CHAIR announced that the Senate had adopted two orders, as follows:

Ordered. That until further notice the attendance before the Senate of the managers and the respondent will not be required.
Ordered. That when the Senate sitting in impenchment adjourn, it be till Monday next, at

The Senate then adjourned till to-morrow. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. Under the regular call of States the following, among other bills, were introduced for refer-

By Mr. BUCKNER, of Mo.: Bill to authorize the repaying of Pennsylvania avenue.

Also, bill for the relief of Patrick Burns, of Also, bill for the relief of Sophia S. Washing-Also, bill for the relief of R. T. Merrick; all of

which were referred to the Committee on the Dis-

By Mr. WILLARD, of Mich.: Bill to incorporate, the Washington and Bladensburg rail-cond, and to prohibit the use of steam thereon. Mr. HALE, of Me., offered a resolution directing that the several committees of the House charged with investigations shall conduct the in-

estigations with open doors when testimony is

The House, by a party rote, refused to second the demand for the previous question—yeas 60, nays 91. Mr. HALE then moved to refer the resolution

tions to report back, upon which the year and nays were demanded. The motion was rejected—yeas 96, nays 111.

Mr. WELLS, of Miss., asked leave to offe joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to distribute 500,000 rations to the sufferers by Mr. CALDWELL of Ala. There was enough

bill to carry into effect the HAWAIIAN TREATY. Mr. THOMAS, of Maryland, addressed the House in relation to the power of the House to refuse sanction to a treaty made by the Presider ate, arguing that it had that power. It

was, therefore, perfectly competent for the Hou tion to the treaty. Mr. TUCKER, of Virginia, followed in the same line of argument. When Mr. Tucker's Mr. WOOD demanded the previous question

which was seconded. He then yielded to Mr. Tuckun to conclude his speech. Mr. BANKS, of Mass., replied to the remark of Mr. Tucker, and argued that it was the duty of the House to make this appropriation to earry out the treaty. He referred to the course of Liv. ingston in Jackson's administration, when he threatened France with war if her Chambers did not find the money to carry out the provisions of a trenty, and the House of that day, recognizing the justice of that threat, voted unanimously to put the country in condition for the emergency. He also quoted Jefferson to show that he held that when a treaty was made it was the duty of the House to make the appropriation to carry is into effect. With regard to any matter of reve nue he would not enter into that question now. The question of revenue was not in point. It was

A QUESTION OF NATIONAL DEPENSE. For a consideration the Hawaiian Governs ngreed that they would never sell their country to a foreign Power. Was not that worth some

In the course of forther discounties he alluded to the statement that there was a job in this bill. Perhaps there was. But if there was a job at all it was on the side of the sugar refiners of the At-lantic coast, who had their attorneys here poisoning the minds of members in opposition to the

Mr. WOOD, of N. Y., closed the debate, showed that the important question involved was one of national defense, and, as to that, the United States had exclusive ju islands. The revenue question had no practical application. He feared that sectionalism was creeping into this question, and it was sectionalism hat came near destroying the Union. He therefore appealed to Southern members not to permit secnal views to enter into this question this Congress met he had heard much said about the loyalty of the South, and the determination to live as one people. He did not need to be told that, for he believed they intended it, but the best way to show their devotion to the whole country was to show a broad and enlarged states manship in matters affecting the whole Union.

He believed it was a moral duty to pass the bill, and if it was rejected it would be the last oppor tunity to make a lodgment in the Pacific ocean. The question of the passage of the bill was then taken by year and nays, and it was passed-year

116, nays 101. On motion of Mr. HOLMAN, it was ordered that the session of to-morrow should be informal, and that no business should be transacted, but that the House should only meet and adjourn. Mr. CONGER, of Mich., was appointed a men ber of the committee to investigate Federal offi cors in New Orleans, vice Mr. Charo, declined Mr. HOLMAN tried to have a night session for business, but the House refused, and, at 5:25 p m., the House adjourned.

A BLOODY PIPER.

Confession of Guilt Most Foul. BOSTON, MASS., May 8.—It is reported tha Piper has confessed to the murder of Mabel Young, and also the murder of the Landregas girl, of which he was suspected two years ago.

MORE VICTIMS.

BOSTON, May 8.—It is now quite certain that Piper was the assailant of Mary Tynan, who was mysteriously beaten on July 1, 1874, but after-wards recovered, and is now an inmate of a lunate asylum. He confesses that he attempted to kill her, and says the murder of Mabel Young and Bridget Landregan were both prompted by the use of stimulants, under the influence of which he had an insane desire to shed blood.

THE FIEND'S CONFESSION. Piper, in his confession of the murder of Mabel Young save: "I took the bat from the lower room before or about the commencement of school to kill somebody at that time. I carried it up to the auditorium, but during the session of Sunday-school took it from the auditorium and carried it to the beliry. After the close of school I came down stairs and opened the doors. Then I went up again, at the time I sent away the boys who were playing in the vestibule. After the boys had gone out, and I was still in the vestibule, the little girl came up stairs, and I induced her to go with me into the beliry. There I struck her with the club two or three times, and she fell where the blood was found. Then I picked her up, and carried the body to the place where it was dis-

The Evening Herald says: "There is a feeling abroad among lawyers, detectives, and the public generally that the contradictory stutements now out out by Piper are the result of cool reasoning sessed of, in order to throw doubt upon his san ity in general, or else to show that he has an unntrollable mania for blood for which he is n responsible, and a change in his statement, either the confession of more murders or the denial of munity."

AMUSEMENTS.

The Vokes Family-National Theatre. A large audience greeted the Vokes family last right at the National theatre with the warmest enthusiasm. This elegant combination has lost nothing of its fascinating and mirth-provoking interest. Every time they come to Washington they are welcomed by overflowing houses, and every time they depart the theatre-going people of the Capital are filled with genuine regret Dom Pedro attended the play last night, and a His Imperial Majesty entered the theatre the or hestra, under the charge of Mr. Prospert, per formed the Brazilian grand march. box-the left procenium-had been reached the Emperor walked to the front, in full view of the audience, and remained standing until the concl sion of the piece. He then slightly bowed in ac-

knowledgment, and took his seat, remaining from that time until the close of the performance, apparently one of the most interested spectators. The Great Lecture. ing Mr. Beecher's great lecture, Friday evening ext, should take advantage of the opportunity offered of securing reserved extra charge. To wait till the night of the lecture, and then expect to get a good seat will only meet with disappointment. Be in time. The diagram of the church will remain at Whitaker's bookstore until 8 o'clock at night each day price

Complimentary Concert. The concert given last evening at Willard' hall, in honor of Miss Zadie Jones by her friends was one of her brilliant successes. The differen parts, which were composed of some exceeding! ne vocal and instrumental music, was rendered in a most successful manner, which drepeals of applause from the delighted audience many of the parts being recalled. Miss Jone rendered some excellant solos in her usual capt vating style, which amply repaid the good! number present for their attendance, an i doing honor to herself and her friends who had the management of the concert. The programs was as follows, the accompaniments being p by Miss Susie Johnson: "Barcarolle," Adia Dr. J. P. Caulfield; "Mia Piccirella," Oper "Salvator Ross," by Miss Zaidee Jones; "L Favorita," Donizetti, by Miss Jeannie Bryan an Mr. W. A. Widney; Aria from "Der Fre schnetz." Von Weber, by Mr. F. Knoop: "Qui est homo," "Stabat Mater," by Miss Jon Mrs. J. P. Caulfield; "Polonaise," Chopin, by D: J. P. Caulfield; "Bliss forever Past," Baife, I Ressini, by Miss Bryan, Mr. Knoop and Mr. Wic ney; English Ballad, Ganz, by Miss Jones; "trust in thee," Opera "Lohengrin," by Miss Jones, Mrs. Caulfield, Mr. Knoop and Mr. Widney.

The Bohemian Girl Matinee The illness of our regular musical and dra critic has prevented our doing full justice to the excellent operatic representations of the Fair lamb Opera Troupe, in which all Washingtonian should take pride as a rare artistic achievement, doing honer to our city as well as to the talented and indefatigable projector and director and his and inderatigable projector and director and hi associates. The matines, to be given to day, (Tuesday,) by general request, should at tract a large house, as it is admitted that "The Bohemian Girl" is rendered more continual. Bohemian Girl" is rendered more completely and in better style by the Fairlamb troupe than by the professionals. The cast will be as before and all the accessories, the soldiers, the children's hallet, the ponies and hunting dogs the same, fur nishing a series of striking and beautiful tableaux in addition to the fine rendering of the ever popular music. The box-abeet, at pupular prices, is now open at Metserott's,

PEDRO D'ALCANTARA.

HE IS A VERY EARLY BIRD THAT CATCHES MANY SIGHTS

A MOMENT HERE, ANOTHER THERE

RECEPTION AT THE WHITE HOUSE

A STIR AT THE POST OFFICE

Now You See Him, Now You Don't

as possible during his short solourn at the Capital. after taking a cup of tea, a few moments after he arose yesterday morning, signified his desire to go immediately to the Smithsonian. So, before taking breakfast, Senor Borges, the Brazillian ter, drove up, and the party, consisting of the Emperor Dom Pedro, the Vicinde de Bom Retiro, Arthur T. de Mercido, Mr. James T. O'Kelley, and the minister, proceeded to the Smithsonian Institute, where Professor Henry met them, and escorted them through the build ing. The party then drove to the Agricultural Department, and after a short stay there they returned to the Arlington for breakfast. The trips to the Smithsonian and Agricultural De partment were made before 9 o'clock. At 10 the Emperor partook of a hearty breakfast, and in a few moments after Senor Borges and His Imperial Majesty again entered the former's cardrawn by two beautiful dapple greys, and were driven first to the Botanical gardens where they remained about half an hour. From the gardens they proceeded to the east front of the Capitol, and entered, visited the Congressional library and

Supreme Court room. Leaving the court-room the party took seats in the diplomatic gallery of the House, where they remained for half an hour after the House met, ic gallery of the House, where they several members paying their respects to His Majesty. From the House the party went to the diplomatic gallery, remaining there nearly an hour listening to the argument of Hon. Jere Black in the impeachment trial. The Emperor and suite having "done" the Capitel pretty thoroughly now, in the two days, again entered their carriages. Leaving the Capitol the party were driven to the White House, where they were received by Secretary Fish, who introduced His Majesty and suite to the President, and after a few moments' pleasant chatting the party ad-journed to the Red Room, where they were preented to Mrs. Grant and Mrs. Col. Fred Grant. All formality being thrown aside, almost an our was passed in social conversation, the party expressing themselves highly pleased with their ordial reception. After dinner the party drove the Government Printing Office, where Mr. Clapp took them in charge, showing them the workings of the composing, book-binding, press and stereotyping rooms. Especially pleased was His Majesty with the process of preparing stereotype and electrotype plates. Mr. Clapp intro-duced the Emperor to Mr. Joyce of the office, whose patent relief-line engraving process Dom Padro took great interest in, watching closely the whole wrote his autograph in the composition, followin the preparation of the plate, and printing the fac similie of his autograph from first to last. From the Government printing office the party returned to the Arlington, where his Imperial Majesty remained until 8 o'clock, at which time, in company with the Visconde and Senor Borges, he was driven to the National theatre to with the performance of the Vokes family. The programme of the movements of the Emperor to-day s unknown, though in all probability, should the weather prove favorable, he will go to Mount Vernon. A special car has been provided for his use between here and Philadelphia, but he has

From Philadelphia, where he will arrive in time to witness the opening of the Centennial, the Emperor goes to New Orleans, returning to Washington by June 10, accomp

Quite an amusing incident occurred at the Post Office Department yesterday. About 2 o'clock in the afternoon a gentleman, accompanied by a 'adv, stepped in to get a sight of the that they looked like foreigners. In an instant that they looked like foreigners, the thought struck him that it was His Majesty, them Pedro and he whispered to another official Dom Pedro, and he whispered to another official of the same rank: "There's Dom Pedro." Messenger No. 2 told a clerk, the clerk told another. and so it spread like wildfire that the Post Office had a royal visitor. Pretty soon the passage leading to the dead letter office was througed to with clerks anxious to got a glimpse of His Majesty. In the meantime messenger No. 2 slipped in to Mr. Dallas, head of the division of dead letters, and told him that it was Dom Pedro who was in the room. Mr. D. who had, until then, taken no notice of visitors, sprang up and began to bow and scrape, at the same time apolo-gizing for his inattention, after which he pro-ceeded to show them through the office, at the same time giving an elaborate description of everything. As he was about two thirds through a gentleman, who had seen the Emperor in New York, whispered the truth to Mr. Dallas, A more clerks by this time got wind that it was not the Emperor after all, and dispersed as quickly as possible. The last seen of Mr. D. he was armed

with a club looking for the messenger that fooled

THE METHODIST CONFERENCE.

More About the Book Concern. BALTIMORE, May 8 .- Bishop Foster presided at e opening of the conference this me nediately after religious services, Dr. Hitchcock, sr., agent of the book concern at Cincinnati, rose question of privilege and inquired of the sented to the conference by Dr. Lanahan on Satarday last in reference to the western book con-

Dr. Hitchcock proceeded with carnestness and warmth to comment on the memorial presented by Dr. Lanahan on Saturday last, charging the insolvency of the western book concern, and contending that the allegations of the memorial were

The secretary, Rev. Mr. Woodruff, disclaimed

Bishop Harris's motion for a special committee of five to investigate the alleged omission was then amended by authorizing Dr. Lanahan to Wm. Rice, H. B. Ridgeway, C. Altman, James nounced as the committee.

The fraternal delegates from the Methodist Episcopal church in Canada, Rev. J. A. Wil-liams and Hon. John McDonald, M. P., were inroduced to the conference by Bishop James, also ishop Carman, of Canada, and Re berry, and 11:30 a. m. to-morrow designated as the time for their reception.
Several memorials were presented and referred

adjourned to to-morrow. Freshet in the Mississippi.

St. Louis, May 8.-The river has been rising at this point with unusual rapidity since Saturday night, and is now higher than at any previous of an inch and a half to two inches per hour. The levee is nearly submerged in low places, and an additional rise of three feet will flood many collars on Front street. Parts of East St. Louis are inedated, and considerable damage has already thrown up in places to prevent encroachment of the waters, and other preparations are in progress to meet the rising water coming out of the Mis-souri and Upper Mississippi.

inson upon the dramatic stage, in her own play of "A Crown of Thorns," was made this evening, at the Globe Theatre, before the largest audience ever in the building. The play and performance made a favorable impression. Miss Dickinson favorable impression. Miss Dickinson ived with much enthusiasm and a profu-

Anna Dickinson's Debut.

CABLE PLASHES.

LONDON, May 8.—The Emma, of Dunkirk, had been wreeked at Lothiron, on the east coast of Caithness, Scotland. The crew report that six other French vessels engaged in the Iceland fish-ing trade have been lost, and it is feared that the whole fleet has been destroyed. LONDON, May 8.—The Standard's special dis-patch from Madrid says the Ministerial papers, Spece and Polifics, state that ex-Queen Chris-tine will return to Spain about the and of May,